UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Encouragement for Pacifists - - - - - - - - - - *Richard B. Gregg*

The Comedy of Non-Intervention - - - - - - - - - - *Ellen Horup*

The Cinderella of Geneva - - - - - - - - - - *Bernhard Mollenhauer*

Interview With Muriel Lester - - - - - - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

VOLUME CXIX NUMBER 7

Chicago, June 7, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 127
Jottings—J. H. H. 130

ARTICLES—

Encouragement for Pacifists—RICHARD B. GREGG 130
The Comedy of Non-Intervention—ELLEN HORUP 132
The Cinderella of Geneva—BERNHARD MOLLENHAUER 135
Interview with Muriel Lester—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 137
My Russian Impressions, Conclusion-Part I—RABINDRANATH TAGORE (Translated by Basanta Koomar Roy) 138

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—

We Are Not Men—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 134
The Average Citizen—E. GUY TALBOTT 134
Cages—PEARL HOGREFE 134

STUDY TABLE—

A Program for Peace Workers—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 142
Overcome Evil with Good—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 143

CORRESPONDENCE—

Minorities and the Court—MAY STRANATHAN 143
Proportional Representation—WALTER J. MILLARD 143
A Grand Tribute from a Grand Friend—SYDNEY STRONG 144

THE FIELD—

Philippine Militarism Under Fire—*Nofrontier News Service* 126
Obey Blindly!—*Nofrontier News Service* 144
An Appeal—J. H. H. 144

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Philippine Militarism Under Fire

Definite concessions to widespread criticism in the United States of Philippine militarism and the part played in it by the American Military Mission, are indicated by recent events understood by observers "in the know" at Washington. The notorious conscription law fostered by the Philippine president, Manuel Quezon, with the aid of General Douglas MacArthur, which permits compulsory military training of young boys and girls and which was calculated to give the Philippine government a draft army five times the size of the United States army for a population of only some 12,000,000, has been crumbling in actual practice under the hammer blows of adverse comment from the peace forces.

At one time the conscription law proposed to draft no fewer than 1,250,000 men. The number has now been reduced to a proposed 400,000. The professional standing army which was originally slated to consist of 19,000 soldiers is now announced at the "marked down" figure of 10,000. The first batch of conscripts, expected to number 50,000, has been brought down to 20,000.

Not long ago the Emergency Peace Campaign, the National Peace Conference, the National Council for Prevention of War, and other anti-militaristic organizations launched a crusade of public education on the extraordinary details of the Philippine armament program. They demanded the recall of the United States Military Mission altogether. Letters began to pour in on Washington. Press publicity initiated by the Nofrontier News Service and other agencies began to take effect. It is rumored around the Capitol, and the facts make the rumors seem distinctly plausible, that a quiet and persistent pressure has been exercised by the government against such a wholesale program of militarization in the Philippines. It is pointed out that the administration, though not averse to military preparedness on a large scale in the U. S. A., understands that the only salvation and security

(*Continued on page* 144)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIX MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1937 No. 7

THE VISION OF THE WORLD

I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue;

Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder-storm;
Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapped in universal law.

—From *Locksley Hall*
Alfred Tennyson

FINIS

That the uprising against the President on the Supreme Court issue is successful no longer remains in doubt. Mr. Roosevelt's program of attack and reform stands hopelessly beaten, and it only remains to beat the various compromise proposals which are now being urged to save the President's face in the one most humiliating experience of his public life. For there can be no compromise on an issue which is essentially a moral and not a political issue. If this were an ordinary matter such as divides parties and prompts legislation, mutual adjustment of some kind would be in order. But the President's opponents have set their faces against a packing of the Court which represents the most dangerous attack upon our democracy since the Civil War. From this standpoint, to add two justices is as bad as to add six. It is the principle of the thing—and that can't be compromised! If Mr. Roosevelt persists in his course, such conduct can only confirm the charge of his most ruthless enemies that he wants not a liberal Court but a subservient one. As a matter of fact, he has always had a liberal Court, even if only by the small margin of 5 to 4. Now, since the retirement of Mr. Justice Van Devanter, the Court has a two-to-one majority for liberalism. Who could reasonably ask for more than this in a free democracy? To persist in the policy so unadvisedly proposed in the President's Supreme Court measure, therefore, can only mean that the administration intends not to remake the judicial power, but to break it altogether. This, of course, would be a long step toward one-man government in this country, not to be considered by Mr. Roosevelt for a moment unless he has been literally turned to madness by the great popular acclaim granted him in the last election. Such a supposition is to us incredible. We anticipate that the Supreme Court issue will now, in one way or another, fade out of the national picture.

THE MOSCOW TRIALS AGAIN

From the beginning UNITY has taken the position that the Moscow conspiracy trials were "incredible" (see UNITY, February 15, page 223). It was impossible to believe either possible conclusion—that the defendants were guilty, or that the Kremlin was butchering innocent men. The whole thing was too crazy for belief either way. For this judgment we have been much abused, particularly by the Soviet advocates of "Moscow can do no wrong." But now comes interesting, and we think impressive, confirmation of our incredulous attitude. Some time ago the *New Republic,* in an effort to secure a basis of judgment "concerning the guilt or innocence of the accused in the Moscow trials," submitted the official reports of these trials, together with the published material on the Trotsky side, to Prof. Fred Rodell, of the Yale School of Law, "with the request that he read them as a legal expert trained in the evaluation of testimony" and submit his conclusions. In the May 19th issue of the *New Republic,* Professor Rodell reports that, after reading all the material, he knows as little about what really happened as before he started. "I might just as well have read *Alice in Wonderland,*" he says. The evidence brings no conviction either way. "There was nothing sufficiently tangible for me to feel *this* is true, or *this* isn't true. Nothing but words and words and talk and talk . . ." The whole thing, concludes Professor Rodell, "might have been a frame-up, or every word might have been gospel truth." As for the Trotsky material, it "is not affirmatively convincing either." There is no case on either side. "The two cancel each other out and leave exactly nothing." All of which precisely confirms what we have felt from the beginning! So far as the trials are concerned, the defendants were not

proved guilty, and their execution was massacre. Only history, in a later age, if ever, can reveal the truth. Meanwhile, we wish well to Professor Dewey's committee of inquiry in its endeavor to get at the facts.

RELIGION IN GERMANY

The religious crisis in Germany is getting ever more acute. The latest attempt to reconcile the Protestants to the Nazi regime has failed, and now apparently Hitler has declared open war on the Catholic hierarchy. Bitterness in this controversy is matched by confusion; not only in this country but in Germany itself, there is misunderstanding as to the forces at work. At bottom it must be remembered that there are three religious groups in contemporary Germany, of which Protestantism and Catholicism are lumped together as one. It seems amazing that the church of the Pope and the church of Luther should ever in any sense unite, but Hitler sees them as one, and, under the impact of his iron rule, the churches themselves are being driven into union. The *Fuehrer* sees Christianity in both of its historic branches as a single cult, which may practise its peculiar rites of worship but is not to intrude in the slightest degree upon the life of the nation. This is the first religious group! The second is German Christianity, and Rosenberg is its prophet. This is an attempt to take Hitler's peculiar racial and national ideas, and dress them up in the garb of Christianity. It would save Christianity, but as an Aryan faith captured and betrayed by the Jews, and thus now to be remade into the likeness of Nazi Germanism. Its supreme extravagance is the contention that Jesus was not a Jew, and his ministry an independent movement warred upon by Jews. The third religious movement in Germany today is Neo-Paganism, and Wilhelm Hauer is its prophet. What this movement lacks in numbers, it makes up in fanaticism. It throws Christianity overboard as an alien cult. Jesus was probably a Jew, and for this reason must be repudiated! Out of their own history and life must Germans build their faith; in the traditions and practices of Teutonic tribes find the substance of their religion! As an attempt to spiritualize nationalism and racialism, this Neo-Paganism is interesting but at bottom crazy. Be it noted that Hitler is *not* a Neo-Pagan, which is a tolerated heresy.

LIBERALISM A BLIGHT ON RELIGION!

Dr. Henry C. Link is the author of an important and influential book, *The Return to Religion.* He is an expert psychologist who has given much highly specialized attention to the study of contemporary religious phenomena. When this man declares that "the influence of religion is waning," and gives reasons for his declaration, something has been said which calls for attention. When he includes among his reasons "liberal education and the liberal mind" as the "most destructive influence in the country," something is added which is startling. The liberal mind, says Dr. Link, is "the mind systematically cultivated to question the traditions and morals of the past; the mind habituated to doubt the old and to place credence in the new; the mind which accepts no authority except the authority of its own reason." This mind, continues Dr. Link, is "the road to moral, social, and economic anarchism—the road to chaos and revolution. And this is the road we are traveling today. Yet our religious leaders . . . do not even know it." Here is testimony well calculated to give a first-class jolt to Unitarians, Universalists, and other liberals who think themselves to be on the road of progress and not of chaos. Is there any truth in it? This truth, at least—that it is liberal religion of various types which is disintegrating these days, and orthodox religion which is still holding together. The churches everywhere are declining in power and influence, and the liberal churches faster than any others. If the liberal mind is "destructive," here is good evidence of it. But notice, please, that in his final implications, Dr. Link's indictment of liberalism applies to every field of human life—it is "moral, social, and economic anarchism" which he is concerned with as well as religious. But is this all the consequence of liberalism? Or is it the world itself, grown old, which is dropping to pieces, and the liberal mind which is alone recognizing the process and pointing the way out to a new and better world? Dr. Link has not penetrated deep enough; he has mistaken surface trends for fundamental forces. The liberal mind, like a sensitive seismograph, locates and records the cosmic upheaval. The liberal mind, like the unswerving compass needle, shows the path to safety.

SEGREGATION—FIGHT IT WHEREVER IT APPEARS!

It seems curious that in this country we should be duplicating a fight which has been going on in India for human rights. The two countries seem so different—yet humanity is everywhere the same and encounters always the same problems! In India for years Gandhi has been fighting the segregation of the Untouchables. A peculiarly terrible instance of this segregation was seen in the proposal under the new constitution to set the Untouchables apart as a separate community, with their own representation, voting rights, etc. This was deceptively a forward step, accepted by the Untouchable leaders, but Gandhi, with clear vision, saw that its implications were nothing less than the permanent outlawry of the Untouchables from the great body of Indian society. So he would have nothing of it! Now, in this country, the same issue has appeared in the attempt to unite the various severed bodies of the great Methodist Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Colored Methodist Church, all these are to be brought together, according to the proposal, into a single national body, divided into five confer-

ences, of which one is to be colored. These conferences are in every way to be equal in their powers and privileges, but four of them are geographical and the fifth racial. The Negro Methodists, in other words, are to be forever segregated in their own churches and conference. This means discrimination, and the Negroes are against it. In this we believe they are right. When the colored churches, two generations ago, withdrew from the Methodist Church, South, in which they suffered inequalities and indignities, they did this as a matter of dignity and self-respect. Now, when they are invited to come back, they insist, in the same spirit of dignity and self-respect, that they be received as men or not at all. Segregation is of course an aspect of slavery—a hangover from the old days of servitude and subjection. It has got to go!

A GREAT STORY

Gone With the Wind, Pulitzer Prize winner, is an extraordinary literary phenomenon. It shows, as did *Anthony Adverse* before it, what the function of literature really is, and in what the soul of man really delights. It is as old as Homer, this function of literature and this delight of man in the world of romance, imagination, action. Only in recent years have these things been despised, and a so-called literature produced of inner states of consciousness and outer stagnations of experience. With the result that more sawdust has been pouring from the presses under the guise of fiction in recent years than in any previous period of history! What wonder that people are starved, and seize upon *Gone With the Wind* as a famished dog might seize upon a juicy steak! For this Margaret Mitchell novel is a great book. Of course, it is being ferociously attacked. Thus, the highbrow literary critics, who rave over such stuff as Joyce, and Faulkner, and Gertrude Stein, and Virginia Woolf have put out in recent years, deny that this story is literature at all. They said the same thing about *Anthony Adverse.* They would have said the same thing about *Ivanhoe* and *Quentin Durward, A Tale of Two Cities, Westward Ho, The Last of the Mohicans,* had they been living in the great days which saw the publication of these masterpieces. As a matter of fact, by every test of real literature from the *Odyssey* of Homer to *Kristin Lavransdatter* of Sigrid Undset, *Gone With the Wind,* "belongs." It is also charged that Miss Mitchell's story is hopelessly stereotyped in a peculiarly sentimental sort of way. She gives us the traditional "Old South," with the white-pillared manor houses, and the "darky" slaves, and the lordly master and gay young blades. Just as Cooper gives us all the familiar trappings of "the noble red man" in the primeval forest, and Scott of the mail-clad knights in the Middle Ages! But what does a writer do with these trappings is the question—and Miss Mitchell does a lot. Lastly, Miss Mitchell is accused of maligning the Negro, lauding the Ku Klux Klan, and defaming the Yankees of reconstruction days. This is the silliest charge of all. It is like denouncing the Shakesperean drama because the Stratford bard was not a democrat, or outlawing *Cyrano de Bergerac* because Rostand did not make his hero a pacifist. It happens that Margaret Mitchell, born and brought up in Atlanta, presents a southern viewpoint of slavery, as Harriett Beecher Stowe presented a northern viewpoint. One is as legitimate as the other, and neither is of any importance, from the literary point of view. So we commend *Gone With the Wind* to our readers as a great story.

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

John D. Rockefeller, dead on May 23d last, was the last of his tribe—that tribe of industrial brigands who used the development of continental America as a means of amassing such fortunes as the world had never hitherto seen. The Standard Oil magnate was the greatest of them all. His empire became not merely a national but an international empire, his wealth the most abundant in history, and his power beyond calculation. He lived a double life, both coincidently in the first half of his career in his personal piety combined with his ruthless and utterly unscrupulous business activities, and successively in the second half of his career which followed his era of money-making with a period of such wise and bounteous philanthropies as still remain unmatched in an age of multifarious benefactions. Of his early years, when he was making Standard Oil the best hated as well as the most powerful industrial unit in the world, the record has long since been written. Henry D. Lloyd immortalized the dreadful tale in his *Wealth Against Commonwealth.* Ida D. Tarbell wrote it in her classic volumes on *The History of the Standard Oil Company.* Official governmental investigations and reports have verified forever the facts of cruel competition, commercial plundering and political corruption which make this story a narrative of piracy. When the work was done, the vast fortune consolidated, there came a change. Mr. Rockefeller now began to give away lavishly, constructively, beneficently, a considerable portion of the wealth which was pouring in upon him like a flood. His foundations, medical and educational, reared to proportions never before known, straightway began to cover the globe. The work of these foundations constitutes one of the supreme glories of modern times. Beyond all calculations is the darkness which has been illumined, the ignorance conquered, the pain relieved, the disease healed, the death retarded or dismissed, by these Rockefeller millions. Yet the question remains—is the world doomed, as under capitalistic industrialism, to purchase its progress at such a price? One thinks, at the end of it all, the years of philanthropy following the years of plunder, of the words of Lady Macbeth—"Here's the smell of the blood still . . . All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand."

Jottings

The prevailing 5-4 split in the Supreme Court is now matched by the 10-8 split in the Senate Judiciary Committee on the issue of the Court. This obviously means that the Committee ought to be packed. Add six new members at once!

In New York City today, traffic has got to the point where, at certain hours, automobiles hardly move at all. In 1939, hundreds of thousands of visitors will come to New York in automobiles to see the World's Fair. The prize exhibit of the Fair will be the traffic jam.

On the basis of the present homicide rate, Professor Ladd, head of the Chicago Staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, predicts that "nearly 300,000 persons now living in this country will be murdered." Automobile deaths in the first three months of this year were one-third more than for the same period last year. What wonder that Professor Sorokin, of Harvard, estimates that the chance of violent death is 6500 times as great today as it was in the Middle Ages!

The debt of the United States has passed the $35,000,000,000 mark—and is still going up. There was once an unsinkable ship that was given so heavy a load to carry that—she sank!

Judge Van Devanter, whose continuance on the bench at a great age was cited as the first argument for the President's packing of the Supreme Court, is now being attacked for resigning and thus spoiling the President's case. Damned if you don't—and damned if you do!

Serious trouble in the Philippines! Commissioner-General McNutt orders all toasts drunk to him next after President Roosevelt, and thus before President Quezon. The latter denounces such indignity to himself and the Filipinos. We would settle this question the way we would settle many others—by having no drinking allowed. J. H. H.

Encouragement for Pacifists

RICHARD B. GREGG

On the face of things these appear to be gloomy days for pacifists. But in this state of affairs we are likely to see what has so often happened before in the realm of human thought and action. When intense, prolonged, deep, and widespread need is felt for the practical application and development of an idea, the seed of that idea, which may have been expressed by one or several geniuses maybe thousands of years previously, is likely to be put rapidly into a form suitable for the needs of the time and applied in successful action.

Several instances of this sort are told in Lancelot Hogben's recent brilliant book, *Mathematics for the Million.** For example, the two basic ideas of logarithms were stated by Archimedes (287-212 B. C.) and one of the old Alexandrian geniuses about 1500 years before Napier developed them and put them to practical use. In Archimedes' day the Greeks used the letters of their alphabet for numbers. They had no zero and no positional system to give different values to their alphabet numbers. Hence for them multiplication and division were fearfully difficult, and really large numbers could not be manipulated or even expressed at all. By Napier's time, astronomy and navigation had developed so far that a serious need was felt for a method of easy and rapid handling, especially multiplication and division, of very large numbers. Also by that time commerce and finance had grown so that in these fields much larger figures were being used than ever before. The old prohibition against usury had broken down, and rapid ways were needed by many people for calculating interest and interest tables. Such strong social need being present, logarithms were born to answer it.

Again, the germinal ideas of the differential calculus go back to an old Alexandrian named Theon about 350 A. D., while the basic ideas of the integral calculus were foreshadowed by the old Egyptians long before Christ, and also by Archimedes. Those ideas had to wait for many centuries until the development of the steam engine and swiftly moving machinery made it imperative to have a form of mathematics which could deal with motion and mechanics. Then, in response to that social and economic need, those old seed ideas came to life and were developed and swiftly applied by Newton and Leibnitz in the two forms of the calculus.

The same thing happened in science and technology. About 100 B. C. Hero described a considerable number of mechanical inventions including a model steam engine, a double forcing pump, a cyclometer, and a theodolite. We all remember that the Chinese invented gunpowder long before it was put to practical use. Leonardo da Vinci speculated about flying machines and other modern devices. In all these cases the ideas were not put to work until a strong need had developed, together with an advance in various kinds of supplemental knowledge and skill which made practical application possible. The long delay did not prove that the ideas were impossible or that mankind was forever in the mass too stupid or too ignorant to use them.

I think it is probable that we may see a similar development of non-violent resistance for the settlement of human conflicts. The seed ideas were expressed by

*Published by W. W. Norton & Co.

Buddha and the Jain tirthankaras about 500 B. C., by Lao Tsu about 450 B. C., by Socrates about the same time, and by Jesus. These people taught and practised this idea primarily in regard to conflicts between individuals. It was used in a relatively small way in Europe and England by the Albigenses, Anabaptists, Mennonites, and Quakers. Recently Mahatma Gandhi has developed and organized it for mass use, and has tried it on a large scale with considerable success.

We certainly have need for it. For the first time in history *all* cultures are in close and constant contact with one another. That spells intense, prolonged, and widespread conflict on a scale greater than ever before. Science and technology have speeded up social change faster than ever before. As we are creatures of habit and, in the mass, are slow to adopt new concepts and ways, this acceleration of social processes means conflict between old and new, conservatives and progressives, greater than ever before. The population of the world is the largest that it has ever been, so that social and economic defects, together with the closer integration of society, mean suffering on a greater scale, and therefore more dramatic than ever before. All the modes of modern rapid transport, communications, publicity and the movies have immensely enhanced the social sensitivity and dramatic sense of all peoples, and stimulated new thought over far wider areas of mankind. We understand the implications of many things better than ever before. The developments of modern public health and of commerce and finance have compelled us to realize the unity of all mankind more vividly and deeply than we have hitherto. Nations are more self-conscious than formerly. Lastly, science and technology have recently given us instruments and methods of war and violence (the airplane, high explosive bombs, incendiary bombs, and poison gas bombs) which are immensely more destructive and indiscriminate than any former weapons and against which there is no adequate defense, so that war has now become a deadly menace to all civilization and to the lives of vast masses of civilians. This is clearly and strongly realized by great numbers of people, especially in Europe. When Genghis Khan attacked the fertile land of Mesopotamia he slaughtered the entire population and destroyed all their dwellings, canals, and public works. Ever since then it has been a desert. Modern war is able and likely to do the same to any country attacked by a major power. Remember, incendiary bombs have been used in Spain apparently only twice, and gas bombs not at all, so Spain does not yet give an adequate picture of what a big war will be like.

This statement of some of the elements of our situation makes clear that we have an intense, deep, prolonged and very widespread need for a better way of settling human conflicts.

In addition to this need there are developments which supplement the idea of non-violent resistance and help to make possible its mass application. We have learned much about organization and methods of training and discipline. The art of building up morale among large numbers of people has developed much in recent years. Psychology is on its way to becoming a science, so that we are approaching a time when we may learn how to control our inner forces somewhat as science has enabled us to begin to control the exterior forces of Nature. Understanding of the economic factors in international and inter-class relationships is better and more widespread than heretofore. Knowledge of the causes of war and the realities of diplomacy is clearer and more widely extended than in previous times.

The very fearfulness of modern weapons is creating several hopeful factors. War has ceased to be an instrument of precision. Bombing from heights of 20,000 feet and the use of poison gas and incendiary bombs will result in the wounding and slaughter of great numbers of helpless and innocent women and children. The results of modern war will be incalculable in every way. The statesmen who start it are as likely to be killed as any other civilians. Civilian risks are greater than those of the soldiers, for the civilians are not disciplined and cannot be supplied with adequate gas masks or bomb-proof quarters. Statesmen of all nations are dreading war more than ever before. Despite severe provocation, they hesitate to unloose the dogs of war.

In November, 1932, Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin, speaking in the House of Commons, said of the man in the street of any English or European city, "There is no power on earth that can protect him from being bombed. Whatever people may tell him, the bomber will always get through. The only defense is in offense, which means that you have to kill more women and children more quickly than the enemy if you want to save yourselves." This truth has sunk into the minds of the British people. On the military airmen it is having an interesting effect. I was told last summer by a British flying officer that several military airmen whom he knew no longer had pride in their occupation. They knew that their chief job will be to drop bombs on defenseless civilians in enemy cities. The speed and altitude of the bombers put them beyond serious risk of being struck by anti-aircraft bullets. They cannot defend their own cities from enemy air attack. They can have but few combats in the air. About all that is left for them is to take revenge for an attack on their own cities by dropping bombs on the women and children of the enemy. The consciousness of being a defender is gone. Bravery is largely replaced by technical skill. The sense of honor and valor is greatly decreased. That cuts into the heart of their morale.

The beginning of another change is suggested in Captain B. H. Liddell Hart's most recent book, *Europe in Arms*. Captain Hart is the military advisor of the *London Times,* the author of the article on military strategy in the last edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* and an authoritative critic and writer on military history and biography. In the introduction of his new book he says that non-violent resistance has shown real power, that its moral position is advantageous, and he warns the government that those who profess faith in it should not be persecuted. For so clear a thinker on military affairs to make such admissions may indicate that some military leaders themselves begin to lack complete confidence in their own methods and feel the need for more efficient and less dangerous ways of settling great conflicts.

It is true that the forces making for war are very strong and the situation is threatening. It is true that human habits have vast inertia. Yet they do change, and sometimes quite rapidly. Legal slavery went, after a long history. And for recent examples of swift change in matters of importance, look at the new attitude toward birth control and the recent changes in Amer-

ican food habits. It is true that most people are "from Missouri" and need visible demonstration before they will believe and adopt something new. A considerable demonstration of non-violent resistance has been provided by Gandhi and there have been many other examples on a small scale. It may be that we are all so insane that we are incapable of using the idea of non-violent resistance in order to solve our conflicts. Many civilizations before this have failed, and this one may, too. The moral basis of our society may well be now too weak to support it. Yet we are not without power of growth in morality, of learning, of discipline, and of knowledge of this way to strengthen our civilization. Though the balance of our civilization may be more precarious than that of earlier ones, yet we have hopeful knowledge, powers, and abilities that were not available to former ages. Of all creatures, man is the most sensitive, mostly highly organized, most delicately balanced, most aware, most adaptable, most able to change habits, least committed to any one specific mode of conduct, as Gerald Heard has so interestingly shown in his book, *The Source of Civilization.* Ability to change in the face of great danger to the species is an inherent evolutionary quality in man. Hence, to make such a change now would be likely, because it would be consistent with his whole evolutionary history and character.

We have the opportunity. That being so, there is no place for despair. Let us accept the responsibility gladly and go forward with all our energy.

The Comedy of Non-Intervention

ELLEN HORUP

Non-intervention began in China, where total war was waged for the first time after the world had got its League of Nations. The Japanese shells and gas bombs fell over towns crammed with people. They fell on schools, hospitals, and homes for the helpless. The representatives of the financial interests of the Great Powers who have seats in the League of Nations could not see that there was anything to gain by interfering. They let the bombs fall, the towns burn, and the Chinese perish.

It was not called non-intervention, but that is what it was. For the members of the League of Nations did not know there was a war on. They had simply noticed that in two countries in the Far East there had been a sudden demand for war material, a demand which they conscientiously fulfilled. When the Manchukuo Empire was an established fact, they therefore refused to recognize it both de jure and de facto.

Actually it was only de jure. They were obliged to recognize it de facto. If they wanted their capital and their commodities placed in the enormous country that was to be exploited capitalistically, or civilized, whatever may be the term chosen, they naturally had to negotiate with Japan who had captured it, and not with China who had lost it, or with the "independent" Emperor of Manchukuo.

The next occasion on which the League of Nations experienced the total war was in Ethiopia. Then it was sometimes non-intervention in favor of the aggressor, sometimes intervention in favor of England. Both were sometimes purely imperialistic without the coöperation of the League of Nations, sometimes imperialistic in conjunction with it.

It began with the agreement at Stresa between the three Great Powers on conditional non-intervention—i. e. an open breach of the Covenant of the League of Nations, where two of its members agree that a third may unimpededly attack a fourth. In order to insure that the conditions were observed, Great Britain sent her fleet into the Mediterranean as a private imperialistic threat of intervention.

As this did not frighten Mussolini, Great Britain walked into the League of Nations again and started sanctions against Italy. They were worthless, for they were not carried through. And even if they had been, they would not have been in Ethiopia's favor, but in England's. They had nothing to do with Ethiopia's right as a member of the League of Nations to exist as an independent country.

While England was intervening together with the League of Nations in her own favor, France intervened in favor of Italy against whom the sanctions were aimed. While the aggressor, Mussolini, supplied himself with everything he needed, the French at Djibuti held everything back that should have gone to the Negus by the French railway. When at the close of April, 259 tons of poison gas had gone through the Suez Canal, the Committee of Thirteen (the League of Nations without Italy's delegate) asked the International Red Cross to send in a report on the action of the gas. But the president, the Swiss professor Max Huber, refused. It turned out later that the professor was also president of a large concern which receives its raw materials from Italy and which has invested almost thirty-four millions, more than half of its foreign capital investments, in Italy.

During the League sanctions, which apparently were directed against Italy as the aggressor against Ethiopia, came the Laval-Hoare proposal which divided Ethiopia in favor of the Great Powers. Laval fell, and Hoare fell, and, accompanied by the expectant cheers of the crowd, Mr. Eden came along in his swan-boat on the wave of popular indignation to fight for the League of Nations, the Covenant, collectivity, and wronged Ethiopia.

The fight ended in defeat of everything Mr. Eden was to save; the sanctions collapsed of themselves. Ethiopia was erased from the map and handed over as a colony to the murderous pacification of the Italian Empire. But the storm of indignation had died down, and in calm water Mr. Eden was able to sail back to his island home. Hoare was rehabilitated and was given another portfolio, and the honor of Laval was saved.

Everything was well, except that in Geneva, M. Avenol, the Secretary General of the League of Nations, stood gazing with yearning eyes in the direction of the land with the blue sky, where the oranges

glow and where the laurels grow. And as the expected did not come, M. Avenol himself set out. He longed to know what Mussolini demanded for returning to the League of Nations, one of whose members, Ethiopia, he had just extinguished and whose representative was Secretary General Avenol.

In this murder of one of its members, the League of Nations went a little further in its indulgence toward the murderer than in the China-Japan war. It acknowledged Italy's conquest de facto, but not de jure. This nuance means that although Ethiopia is effaced from the map of the world, it is still a member of the League.

The total war comes near and nearer. It is now so near that most countries in Europe are taking part in it in one way or another. From China via Ethiopia it has reached Spain.

The League of Nations regards the war in Spain as not being its concern. This time non-intervention has been delegated to a committee sitting in London. In that committee, where of course the two democratic powers, England and France, have most to say, this non-intervention in favor of the aggressor has reached its culmination.

The non-intervention agreed at Neuchatel in 1900, with regard to a country in a state of revolt, consisted of two points. (1) No one may prevent the lawful government from procuring what it requires in order to quell the revolt, and (2) no one may supply the rebels with war material or money or permit them to use the territory of a foreign state as a basis of military expeditions against the government.

Thus in its true substance the non-intervention of the Great Powers in the Spanish situation was in opposition to the first point and, very quickly, it came into opposition to the second point. The fascist countries' breach of international law, however, was even more rapid. It came not merely before non-intervention, but before the revolt itself. The revolt started July 18. On the 15th of July, three Italian military pilots had received their marching orders. When they made a forced landing on French territory on the way to Spanish Morocco, the French High Commissioner found this document.

In the beginning, the war in Spain was regarded as a civil war. As there is no article in the Covenant to determine the League's attitude in a civil war, the non-intervention agreement for the present was not in conflict with the Covenant. But when in August the Italians sent army planes to Spain, occupied Mallorca and formed a military aircraft base on the island, Spain's foreign minister del Vayo appealed to the Assembly in September. He pointed out the great danger to peace if it should become the custom for a country to begin by provoking a rebellion in another country and then support it with military forces without admitting it, without any declaration of war, or in any other way. The Assembly demanded proofs. They were already available in the Non-Intervention Committee in London. Del Vayo also mentioned the thousands who had become victims of the fascistic airplanes and the foreign war material which were illegally being sent into Spain.

Now it was evident that non-intervention was in conflict with the Covenant. In the face of a military attack on one of its members, the League of Nations has no right to declare itself passive. But the Assembly did not move.

At the beginning of December, Mussolini sent to Spain as many troops and as much material as he considered necessary for Franco to win the war. On the 11th of December del Vayo demanded the summoning of the Council. Now it was Madrid that was at stake. Were further proofs required? Was it not German and Italian airmen who with their bombs were murdering and burning in the capital of Spain? Did not Franco's soldiers call the Fascisti the "blond Moroccans"? If the League continued with its peace policy, del Vayo foresaw a pacified Europe in which all problems were settled by means of international fascism. But the effects of del Vayo's appeal were the same in the Council as it had been in the Assembly.

On December 22 the Committee raised the question of the stoppage of volunteers to Spain. Presumably the term "volunteers" included the Italian regular troops, though many of them believed they were on their way to Ethiopia when they sailed for Spain. Under any circumstance the result would be in the aggressor's favor, as at that time there were almost ten times as many fascistic troops with Franco as there were foreign volunteers with the government. On the same day Italy demonstrated her good-will by landing 6,500 soldiers in Spain. The day before the Anglo-Italian gentleman's agreement, 4,000 more had arrived.

On January 7 Mussolini signified his adherence to the stoppage of volunteers. Nevertheless, he would have preferred that all non-Spanish combatants be withdrawn from Spain. What he meant by that is scarcely worth while pondering over. Ten days later, another 10,000 men arrived from his country in Spain. On January 25 he repeated his adherence, and during the next few days the number of Italian troops in Spain was brought up to 70,000.

As the *Manchester Guardian* says, the Italian diplomats knew what they are talking about. For once the British diplomats did not know so well. On March 6 Lord Cranbourne stated in the Commons that the prohibition had come into force on February 20 at midnight. Next day came a telegram from *The Times'* own correspondent in Gibraltar that on March 6 a steamer had arrived at Cadiz and had disembarked large Italian forces. And as a matter of fact on February 28 Mussolini had already shown how much his word was worth. Then the first 10,000 arrived after the prohibition had been signed by the Powers. And they were not the last.

On March 6 the doors were definitively closed. The warships of the four Powers were now to patrol the coasts of Spain, and international troops the Franco-Spanish frontier. Russia and Portugal wished to be left out of it, and they were. The two fascistic dictators who had shown greater contempt for everything in the form of pacts and agreements than the others (they break them while they give their word and put their names to them) were chosen to enforce an agreement on a coast where their warships and airmen a short time before had bombarded Malaga and their troops had occupied it.

Then came the defeat. During a violent offensive by the government troops, the end came in an almost panicky flight of the rebels not far from Guadalajara, with large numbers of prisoners, soldiers, and officers—all Italian. Additional evidence of Italy's part in the war appeared. Mr. Eden in fact already had a whole museum full. Reports came from delegates, correspondents, professors, British and French members of parliament. From Mme. Brown photographs of Ger-

man Junkers machines, from Lord Hastings copies of papers found on fallen foreign airmen, unexploded incendiary bombs, name-plates of airplanes, Italian parachutes, etc. Then came General Mancioni's congratulations, orders and documents from the Italian prisoners.

Mr. Eden was asked questions in the Commons. He did not know yet if it was true that there were Italian soldiers and officers in Spain. He wanted confirmation of the evidence and would make inquiries in the Non-Intervention Committee. But now events became too thick. They rushed past Mr. Eden and left him to continue his conjuring in which nobody believed.

Mussolini hastened back to Rome—owing to a sand-storm in Lybia—and Signor Grandi declared in the Non-Intervention Committee in London "that not a single Italian volunteer would leave Spain till the civil war was over."

That was plain enough speaking. It meant war, and not non-intervention. And with that one would have expected the whole miserable comedy to come to an end. But no! In the *Manchester Guardian* on March 25 Noel Baker in all seriousness explained how the patrolling Fascists not only can evade the control in six infallible ways, but how they can also make it impossible for the Spanish government to evade control. Lloyd George in the Commons asked what the government would do if it were true that Mussolini was going to send two fresh divisions to Spain. And Mr. Eden's deputy, Lord Cranbourne, was not really fortunate this time either when he averred that "he had no reason whatever for believing that Mussolini intended to do anything of the kind." Regarding the prohibition of volunteers, he insisted that it was being observed.

So the comedy went on.

There remains the question of what is behind this policy. Why did the democratic countries apply immediate sanctions against the constitutional democratic government of Spain? Why did France refuse to sell the government airplanes? Why did Great Britain refuse the government's ships oil at Gibraltar? Why were the government's ships prohibited already on the 9th of August from calling at Tangier? Why is this so-called Non-Intervention Policy maintained in the face of the incessant breaches of it by the Fascisti?

Has the Spanish conflict—like the Ethio-Italian—its Stresa, too, where the Powers made their agreements?

Trumpets on New Horizons

We Are Not Men

We are not men, but soldiers, we;
Each one a robot bound to be,
We bear upon our necks the nation
Topped by the flag in honored station.
Our edges smoothed, our angles planed,
Our ways in long traditions trained,
We stand attentive, numbered, normed,
Both mind and body uniformed.
At high commands we must not blink,
We should not guess, we may not think;
The task required of us is *action*
Timed to the very second's fraction.
We dare not live lest we should die.
Woe, if we whimper, doubt or cry!
We learn the sure technique of hating,
Our spirits cleanly insulating.
And in the fiercest fighting section
Our armor-plate affords protection
Not, to be sure, from hostile darts,
But from the storm of our own hearts.

—Edith Lovejoy Pierce.

The Average Citizen

Let not my peaceful slumber be disturbed
By clanging dins of stark reality.
What if the wolves of greed have not been curbed?
My task is not to set the wage-slave free.
Let starving children sob and widows weep;
My ears are deaf to anguished cries. I sleep!
I sleep—and dream of golden ages gone.
I vision paradise beyond the grave.
The storms of war may gild tomorrow's dawn,
And millions perish underneath its wave;
But these nightmares shall not become my theme.
Such things are no concern of mine. I dream!

Let poets, touched with messianic zeal,
Build if they can a better world today;
Let modern prophets strive to make men feel
That brotherhood is life's enlightened way;
But count me not as one among their number.
Realities are not for me. I slumber!

—E. Guy Talbott.

Cages

Where crowds collect in city parks, I have seen
Quick monkeys, like degraded men, in cages,
Aping captors; bears in helpless rages;
Eagles clipped—their eyes have lost all sheen.
And clever man, who put these bars between
His prey and freedom, learns by rapid stages
To prison men—in subway, mill, in wages
For labor, in crowded life, mechanic, mean.

Hiding himself away from sunset skies,
Wood-smoke, and fragrant earth, in hate and greed
Man prisons self. In crowds he lives alone,
Unblessed by nature, art or love; unfreed
From self, he builds his cage until he dies—
Within his proper cage of flesh and bone.

—Pearl Hogrefe.

The Cinderella of Geneva

BERNHARD MOLLENHAUER

"We stand," says Einstein, "at the parting of the ways. It is for us to find the way of peace or as an alternative to continue along that path of brutal force which is unworthy of our civilization. On the one side there beckons to us the freedom of the individual and the security of commonwealths; on the other the servitude of individuals and the collapse of our civilization. Our fate will be as we deserve."

Many thoughtful observers believe they see the doom of our mechanized civilization in the repeated failures of disarmament conferences and the ill-starred performance of the League of Nations. These are indeed discouraging setbacks to the cause of world peace. Especially so since the peace movement is so closely associated with the fortunes of the League of Nations. However such disappointments need not be fatal if we learn the lessons in these disillusioning experiences. The gods sell everything at a price; world peace is not to be had for the asking.

The day after the Armistice the fighting nations of Europe dropped in their tracks, so to speak, worn out with four years of frantic destruction in which a moneyed class of promoters reaped fabulous profits. Like Cinderella, Peace was summoned from her lowly estate and courted by nations who vied with each other in preparing resolutions and solemn vows of undying friendship. Peace was queen of the hour, more than lady for a day, for it seemed unthinkable on that memorable day in June, 1919, when the Peace Treaty of Versailles was signed that the world was not made safe for Peace and democracy. For was not autocracy gone? Were not the peoples of Europe rid of old masters and provided by the newly created League with the means with which to express their will to Peace in a practical way? Yet within so few years dictators succeeded the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Romanofs. People had cast off old masters only to be more enslaved by new ones. Peace, Cinderella-like, has taken her place again in the shadows, snubbed by Italy and Japan while she appeals to her stepmother in Geneva. But the League can do but little for her now not only because Mussolini and Japanese Imperialism gave her a telling blow but especially because the fate of the League was sealed years ago by the blunders of Versailles. If the big members of the League had admitted Germany into the League with a more just war settlement, its chances of success would have been greater. But the genuine spirit of universal brotherhood was not there. For months after the Armistice a blockade was kept. Germany was humiliated beyond reason while fine phrases about equality and brotherhood were bandied about in Geneva. The Big Powers were unwilling to face the simple shattering fact that one cannot have a coöperative union of any sort if some nations are to be treated as outlaws and misrepresented. In the light of recent events America has no reason to regret keeping aloof from the League of Nations. What has it done for China, Ethiopia, and Spain?

The League was founded on a great principle, the ideal of a federation of free commonwealths imbued with one common purpose. The Big Powers assumed that democracy was here to stay and that the defeated ones would be contented with peace at any price. The peoples involved in the collapse of the Central Powers soon began to feel that the League was being used not to further international good-will and justice but to maintain a status quo. They heard much talk about "self-determination of nations" but could not be blind to the fact that the German people were given small chance to redeem themselves from chaos and poverty. Failure to recognize the fact that no nation will be satisfied with peace at the price of its freedom doomed the League from the beginning. There were other destructive elements in the League which were soon to prove themselves incompatible with its high purpose.

We will understand the situation better if we glance for a moment at the origin of the League idea. The ideal of a League of Nations in its developed form was advocated as early as 1795 by the celebrated German philosopher Immanuel Kant in his remarkable treatise, *Perpetual Peace*. Though a typical professor who never traveled even as far as Danzig, the Sage of Königsberg had an almost uncanny grasp of political realities. Like Woodrow Wilson, he believed it to be his duty and the duty of all men to work for a better understanding between nations. Being more of a realist than Woodrow Wilson, he recognized the impossibility of world peace in his own time under present world conditions. But he believed the history of the race to be a process toward the realization of a plan of nature to bring about in the course of time political institutions under which human mind and character could find their highest and freest expression. In fact, he looked forward to nothing less than the moral regeneration of humanity. But fortunately we need not wait for human perfection before we can enjoy world peace; for just as national law abolished private war on individuals, as in the historic instance of the Decree of Eternal Pacification of 1495, so international war will some day be outlawed by the law of nations supported by a federation of governments. As it was the duty of individuals in early times to enter the state and respect law more than force, so it is now the duty of world rulers to work for a federation of states and to establish an international code of ethics binding on all. Kant held that here the moral law pointed as unmistakably as in the sphere of private affairs, and that the highest good of the nation is to be realized in achieving universal good-will.

Kant wrote his treatise, *Perpetual Peace,* in the form of a treaty in which he reviews the negative and positive conditions of lasting peace. The former he formulates in the Preliminary Articles and the latter in the Definitive Articles. There are six Preliminary Articles stressing the idea that any menace to the peaceful co-existence of the nations should be abolished. These Six Articles are:

1. No treaty of peace shall be regarded as valid, if made with the secret reservation of material for a future war.

2. No state having an independent existence—whether it be great or small—shall be acquired by another by inheritance, exchange, purchase, or donation.

3. Standing armies shall be abolished in course of time.

4. No national debts shall be contracted in connection with the external affairs of the state.

5. No state shall violently interfere with the constitution and administration of another.

6. No state at war with another shall countenance such modes of hostility as would make mutual confidence impossible in a subsequent state of peace: such are the employment of assassins or of poisoners, breaches of capitulation, the instigating and making use of treachery in the hostile state.

Evidently Kant never dreamed of scientific minds selling their talents to lengthen the list of crimes against humanity. May the time come when such enemies of civilization are branded as such and not shielded behind a subtle veil of sophistry!

In Article 4 Kant is not referring to necessary debts contracted for the purpose of economic development of the country or its foreign possessions, but to those debts which are results of war loans and contracts for war materials. A credit system which goes on increasing is a dangerous money power and increases the ease with which war may be waged. War debts embitter peace and sometimes make it more burdensome than a short war.

After commenting on the Preliminary Articles, Kant outlines the positive conditions of peace in three Definitive Articles, as follows:

1. The civil constitution of each state shall be republican.
2. The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states.
3. The rights of men, as citizens of the world, shall be limited to the conditions of universal hospitality.

The last Article is now generally accepted, since China is now open to settlers which was not the case in Kant's time.

In Kant's opinion the first and second Definitive Articles must stand and fall together. For the only state in which each and every person, regardless of rank, is free and equal before a common legislation is the republican state, where the consent of the subjects is required to determine whether there shall be war or not. On this point Kant and Woodrow Wilson are in agreement. By republicanism Kant does not mean democracy, which is the despotism of the crowd, and which in times of stress inevitably passes into some form of dictatorship, but the political principle of severing the executive power of the government from the legislature. It is the form of government most favorable to peace because it has its source in the concept of right and embodies the representative system. It is true that a monarchy may be governed in the spirit of a republic when its ruler regards himself as the first servant of the state; but unfortunately the successors of a peaceful and just monarch are usually quite the opposite. As long as one person or dynasty holds supreme power in a state there is no permanent guaranty of perpetual peace. Scarcely a day passes that we are not reminded of the danger of placing too much power in one man.

The final and lasting federation of nations must be based on a common principle of government. Needless to say that ideal cannot be realized in a single generation but it is a goal we should not lose sight of. Meantime those who love peace must make the best of what they have and build for those who will come after us and inherit the fruit of our labors. Progress in political organization is the slowest of all progress and many are its setbacks and reversals. In astronomy and physics we have made more rapid progress and early mastery but in the less objective sciences of psychology and political science, sociology and ethics, our progress comes later. The human mind goes forth to win knowledge and mastery of nature but comes to itself last. Its greatest triumphs are yet to come and they will be in the realms of political and social science. We stand on an isthmus of time reviewing the changeful features of a chaotic world in which the destructive forces have carried us a long way toward failure. But the end of civilization is not likely because only twice on recorded history has Western civilization gone under. We had to begin all over again after the destruction of the Minoan culture and the decline of Egypt and once again after the fall of the Roman Empire. Of course there is the possibility that the hard-won treasures of human thought may all be lost in tyranny and devastating wars. An eternal vigilance is the price of our security, for ours is indeed the hour of decision. The forces that are to dominate the world for good or ill are rapidly taking shape and bidding for power. Over the portal of tomorrow is written Dantesquely the ominous warning of Spengler. The ghost of Caesarism and the spirit of war die hard. But let us not accept a gospel of defeatism and gloom. As far as prophecy goes, we live under conditions so different from the past that no one can safely forecast the shape of things to come on a basis of historical cycles that have seemingly repeated themselves.

Many writers have interpreted the story of civilization as a remorseless struggle for power. One wonders why they are so bent on playing up the negative and dark side of things. They have a good deal of truth on their side but let us not forget that many early races practised mutual aid and were strangers to war. Love of beauty, character, and a dawning sense of right in the primitive mind were great factors in human progress. It is a crude myth that the first society was formed by rugged individualists for protection against some common enemy and that ethics were invented by the weak to bridle the strong man. "One must emphasize," says Prof. H. J. Fleure, "that human society does not so much result from the coming together of individuals, as that human individuality results from the liberation bit by bit of individual initiative within groups." (Quoted in *Ascent of Humanity* by Heard.) In the Nile valley, primitive man reached such great heights not because he was a great fighter but because his gentler and more spiritual qualities had great survival value. The faces of the statues he made of his gods have a patient serene expression. Man invariably makes God in his own image.

A noted philosopher defined civilization as a society exemplifying the ideals of truth, beauty, adventure, and peace. The problem of civilization with all its hazards and dark aspects is essentially the task of building a more complete and better world within the sphere of human life. In ancient times when the frontiers of civilization were pushing outward, wars of conquest were sometimes the means of spreading culture in savage lands. As civilization advanced and came within the reach of all races, wars ceased to have any cultural significance. More often a conquered people were more enlightened than their conquerors. For example, the Greeks had a more artistic and philosophical type of culture than their Roman masters. In fact our Western culture with its forward looking attitude of mind owes much to the Greek ideal of a free intellectual life.

It is easy to believe in the myth that civilization is the gift of a single great people divinely appointed to tend that civilization. Hence a political messiah coming to a defeated and weary people, with a saving gospel of cultural supremacy and racial purity, may for a time deceive even the elect. But one cannot read even a little history without becoming aware that civilization is a very composite thing. It has taken many races and lands to make even the beginning of our mechanized civilization. The most advanced nation is in a sense the most indebted one, for it draws most heavily from the accumulated knowledge of others. Its cultural life embraces the achievements of scholars and thinkers of every race and clime. Every enlightened

nation is a trustee of the hard-won treasures of human thought and aspiration.

Communism, National Socialism, Fascism, and anti-intellectualism are making over a large part of the world. On this side of the Atlantic we are trustees of the remaining free institutions won for us by the pioneers of civilization. Yet even here the subtle propaganda of militarism and anti-intellectualism is at work. We see it in a thousand forms from teachers' oaths to hysterical attempts to brand every peace organization as a veiled attack upon the United States Constitution. In some circles to be a pacifist is almost synonymous with being a Red. We are not without reason for despair of world peace, yet there is promise of better things to come. The rational and beneficent forces were never better organized and a new recognition of human values is brightening our horizon. Here in America at least the pacifist has the will of the majority on his side though powerful interests shadow him, ever ready to discredit his cause. In advocating complete and immediate disarmament the pacifist lays himself open to attack. He should be mindful of the fact that as long as a large part of the governments of the world are still, let us say, in the Mosaic stage of political ethics, complete disarmament is impractical. The lover of peace should always be a practical person and remember that the "pathway of history is strewn with idealistic tombstones." Reduction of arms is the only safe and practical way to lighten the burden of security. It is a step civilization must take if it is in earnest about world peace, if it is to triumph over the death wish and the cult of war.

The understanding of civilization as the common adventure of mankind in which no one has a special claim above the others is an important step toward peace. The central problem of peace is a problem of education, of acquiring a new scale of values. The youth of the world must be taught the disastrous folly of race prejudice, and of the heresy of old school diplomats who believe that war is a solution to world problems. We have solved nothing by war and surely it is not the justifiable fate of humanity.

A famous writer has said we are witnessing a race between education and a catastrophe. The problem of peace is so vital because no one has security, and no one can say his life's work is lasting until that problem is solved. Human intelligence has won its way through such terrific obstacles in the past that it is unlikely it will now suddenly stop and collapse before its greatest achievements.

Interview with Muriel Lester

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Miss Muriel Lester, of Kingsley Hall, which is a unique community house and children's home in London, recently came to Washington from Florida and the West. During her stay in Washington the writer talked at some length with this noted English social reformer and evangelist of war-resistance, while seated in the luxurious library of her friend and host, Mr. Coleman Jennings.

Miss Lester is the author of a recently published volume of war-time reminiscences, under the strange title of *Kill or Cure,* including the account of the Zeppelin bombings of London, (one of which destroyed a public house across the street from her social settlement and damaged the roof of Kingsley Hall itself). Between speaking engagements, she is busy writing a lengthy autobiography, and reflecting upon her own approach and that of others to the problem of personal and social salvation, for she is something of a "humanistic mystic," or perhaps even a Socialistic mystic; and her conversation indicates an even deeper interest in the emotional and religious values of human experience than in the progress of objective civic reforms. She is, indeed, a "religionist in politics"; and in the midst of a busy life has found time to write several books, among them *Ways of Praying.* In this, she describes how, in the midst of a bad breakdown, she worked out a technique of physical relaxation and spiritual communion which cured her. This has had a wide reading in the United States; as well as a booklet entitled *Why Forbid Us?,* which is a stirring plea for the clerical ministry of women.

Miss Lester was, perhaps, most widely known in the United States as the host of Mahatma Gandhi at her settlement, during the occasion of Gandhi's official visit to London, in 1931, as leader of the Indian Nationalist Movement. When he spoke by short-wave radio to the United States, Miss Lester introduced him, and later accompanied him on his European tour and visit to Romain Rolland, in Switzerland. Since then, she has visited Gandhi twice in India. And her sister, Doris, has succeeded her in the leadership of Kingsley Hall.

Speaking of how she first came to leave her father's country home and seek out an opportunity of larger life and more useful service among the impoverished and overcrowded denizens of the East End of London, Miss Lester—often called the Jane Addams of England—said:

"I am not really the Jane Addams of England, you know. No one can duplicate her life. But, in my case, as I think in hers, it was Count Tolstoy who was largely responsible. It was a reading of his remarkable book, now out of print, entitled *The Kingdom of God Is Within You,* which moved me to seek a larger understanding of life among those who are underprivileged and supposedly disadvantaged."

Speaking of the World War, reminiscently, Miss Lester said that Kingsley Hall was on the direct route from the East Coast to London, and consequently in the line of the dreaded Zeppelins. "We would scan the sky at twilight," she said, "and study our almanacs assidulously to discover when the full moons would appear . . . In the small hours of the morning a siren would be heard. Mothers would jump out of bed in our neighbor's houses, shout at the children, fling coats over them, snatch up the baby and begin the four-minute run to the official dugout in the deep concrete underground cellar of the Common Lodging House, the other side of Bow Church. There we would stay hour after hour, cooped up by the hundred, among rubbish, old bits of stone coping, fowls, women and children of every sort and size. The sleeping children were laid in rows along hastily improvised tables, while another row

of babies would lie on the ground underneath. Babies have been known to choose a dugout during an air-raid as the fitting moment for their dramatic entry into the world! . . . But it wasn't funny when a bomb from a Zeppelin fell on the 'Black Swan' tavern just opposite, killing several people, and when the next one to be released fell on Kingsley Hall, shattering our roof—but mercifully hurting no one.

"When the daylight raids began," she went on, "things became even worse. Once I was sent twenty tickets for a children's play, and went off to the West End Theatre, with a very happy party of children under my wing. We had got as far as the Charing Cross Road when, in the distance, showing very bright and beautiful and gleaming against the sky, there appeared what looked like big silver birds flying towards us—straight from Germany, with the war thundering beyond the Channel, in France. There was panic in the streets. None of us was hurt—but later on a bomb fell on one of our local schools and fifteen girls and boys were killed.

"So you see, I know what war is. And, although you don't hear about it in your newspapers, a very strong movement is afoot in England—a religious movement—setting its face against all war. Canon Dick Sheppard, Anglican clergyman of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, in the center of London, recently called for a hundred thousand war-resisters—and got them. George Lansbury is now in Germany; he is to have an interview with Hitler soon, to plead for peace and an end to the persecutions of the anti-militarists of Germany. We are in touch with hundreds of serious people in Germany and Italy, whom we can assist in various ways, who are resisting military violence and tyranny very bravely . . . and who are prepared to suffer as are we. Thousands of young men are refusing war-service all over the Continent—and taking the consequences manfully. This is one of the reasons why I think that the 'next war' will be delayed, and perhaps prevented. You will be surprised to learn that in England, Mr. Aldous Huxley, the sophisticate and novelist, whose influence has been bad, has recently experienced a religious conversion, has joined the Fellowship of Reconciliation and is writing a book about it. You will hear about that, certainly. And the same thing is true of China, and even of Japan, from which I have recently returned."

Miss Lester has still the air of a young woman, despite her many experiences. In stature, short, with her hair parted severely in the middle, reminiscent of George Eliot, she wears at times a roguish, subtle smile, and at others the stern gaze of a zealot. She seems to be a kind of cosmopolitan mystic, and altogether a bird of passage quite extraordinary—or "extrawdnry," as they say in Bond Street. She will be worth hearing—and meeting, if you can. Lest someone accuse her of being merely a religious sentimentalist, she takes a vital interest in economic questions, and holds war to be a product of economic causes largely. In many of her addresses she quotes the old saying which, she says, was current in the early Church, a thousand years ago, and was then taught as doctrine: "If you possess material superfluities while your brethren lack necessities, you are possessing the goods of others—and are therefore stealing."

My Russian Impressions*

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Translated from the Original Bengali by Basanta Koomar Roy

Copyright, 1937, by Basanta Koomar Roy
Author of "Rabindranath Tagore: The Man and His Poetry"

CONCLUSION—Part I

I have already told you how my first acquaintance with Soviet Russia has profoundly captivated my mind. There are a few reasons for that. They are worth discussing.

Behind the picture of Soviet Russia that is engraved on my mind hangs the black curtain of the misery of India. There lies a moral hidden in the history of the root of that misery. If you stop to think over that moral in connection with the present topic, then it will be easy to understand the currents of thought that are passing through my mind.

The inner desire for the expansion of Mahomedan rule in India was the attainment of the glory of kinghood. In those days this very desire was at the bottom of all the conquests of kingdoms. Alexander the Great of Greece did sweep the alien skies with the fiery tail of the comet of his army for no other purpose than the expansion of his personal power. The Romans, too, were inspired by the same motive. The Phoenicians simply carried on their commerce between different seaports; but they never played at the game of the conquest of kingdoms.

But a new age was ushered in when the commercial fleets of the western nations found their way and anchored in the ports of Asia. Thus ended the age of the warrior (*Kshatrya*); and thus began the age of the merchant (*Vaisyas*). These European merchants slowly began to annex kingdoms to their trading stations. Their main purpose was to increase their profit. So they did not care a straw for that sense of honor that was inherent in the heart of the heroes of war. Consequently they did not shrink at adopting most dishonest methods; for they wanted material success, and not the glory of the hero.

In those days India was world famous for her fabulous wealth. Foreign historians of that period have repeatedly proclaimed this fact. Even Lord Clive himself admitted: "When I think of the wealth of India, I myself wonder at the moderation of my plunder." It is not easy to accumulate such wealth. India produced this wealth herself. The foreign powers that became the rulers of India in those days were engaged in enjoying the wealth of India; and they never did destroy it. In other words, they sought enjoyment, and not trade.

* Written in the period of 1930.—*Editors.*

Then, of a sudden, these European merchants, under the pretext of paving the path of commerce, mounted the throne on their commercial chests of drawers. The time was most auspicious for them. The Mogul empire was on the decline. The Mahrattas and the Sikhs were busy working at its downfall. The English broke it to pieces, and brought about its ultimate destruction.

It cannot be claimed that there was no oppression, no miscarriage of justice, and no misrule whatsoever in India under the glory-seeking rulers of former days. But those rulers were a part and parcel of India. The wounds from their scratches did not penetrate beneath the skin of Mother India. There was plenty of bloodshed. But they did not dislocate the bones at the joints. The various wealth-producing activities of the country were going on uninterruptedly. All these activities were even encouraged and patronized by the Moslem rulers of India. If the facts were otherwise, then there would not have been such a crowded condition of European merchants in India. Why should swarms of locusts gather in a desert?

Then began the strikingly titanic union between the power of commerce and the power of the ruler. The tragic story of the hacking at the roots of the trees of wealth in India by her new commercial rulers has been told a hundred times. And it is ghastly reading and hearing. But one cannot ignore these facts as ancient and hide them behind the mask of forgetfulness. The present hideous poverty of India began in those days. India was glorious in her wealth. If we forget how that wealth has been transferred to the distant little island of England, then we ignore a vital factor in the modern history of the world. The motive power behind modern politics is not glory of power; but it is the greed of gold. We must always bear this in mind. There exists a human relationship between a glory-seeking king and his subjects. This is absolutely impossible when greed of gold controls the king. Wealth is impersonal and it is very cruel. Greed not only gathers the golden eggs; but it also slaughters the hen that lays them.

The greed of the British Merchant-Raj has absolutely crippled the various wealth-producing activities of India. The only thing that is left for us is agriculture. Otherwise, the supply of raw material will be stopped, and India cannot pay for the foreign goods she purchases. The daily livelihood of India hangs from this single, delicate thread.

For argument's sake, let us take it for granted that in competition with modern machinery the prosperous artisans and craftsmen of India have automatically become unemployed. So, in order to protect them it was the imperative duty of the government to most carefully train its subjects in the use of modern machinery. The struggle for existence itself is forcing every country to arduously follow this path. Within a very short time Japan has completely mastered modern machinery for the production of wealth. If it had been impossible for Japan to do this, then she would have been totally ruined both in wealth and in life by the conspiracies of machine-ridden Europe. We were deprived of this opportunity; because greed is inordinately jealous. In the shadow of this gigantic greed of England, both our life and wealth began to fade. And in its place the British-Raj thus comforts us: "For the protection of what is left of your life and wealth, I will take control of the power of the law and the police in my own hands."

And we on the other hand have pawned our food and our clothing, our education and our intelligence to supply the police and the army with their salaries. I tell you, nothing else but greed can nestle at the root of such ferocious indifference on the part of the British rulers of India. For so long, standing degradingly below the altar of knowledge and enterprise, we were despairingly looking up at our rulers only to hear from above these words of consolation: "If you lose your power, be not afraid. We are powerful. We shall protect you."

When a man's relationship with a fellow man is actuated by greed, then profit alone counts. That fellow man can never expect to be respected. And the claims of a man who is not respected are generally minimized to the utmost. At last he becomes so cheap that even his direst needs painfully fail to elicit even the minimum modicum of monetary expenditure. Every one knows of the miserable budget of the British government for the prolongation of our lives, and the decency of our living. We are without food, we are without education, we are without medical attention, and we are without pure drinking water; but there is no dearth of policemen. And there are plenty of fat-salaried British officials. The stream of these high salaries acts as a gulf-stream to counteract the natural chill of the British Isles. And certainly we have to furnish the high salaries of these British officials in India, even from our savings for funeral expenses. The only reason for such a state of affairs is that greed is blind—greed is cruel. And India is an object of greed for her British rulers.

And though we are in a state of poignant pain, I do not deny that there is liberality in English character. In the administration of alien lands, other European powers are more miserly and more cruel than even the British. If India were ruled by some other European nation, it would not have been possible for us to demonstrate the same kind of opposition as we do against the British race and the British rule, both in words and in deeds. If at all possible, then the punishment would have been more unbearable. There are ample incidents right in Europe, and even in America, to illustrate my argument. When even in the days of open rebellion, our people—oppressed by the British officials—go to a British court to lodge a complaint, it proves that our faith in the British sense of justice dies very hard indeed—even when we are being beaten up. We can expect much less from our own Rajas, Maharajas, and the Zamindars (land-holders).

During my stay in England I noticed that the disparaging facts regarding the British administration of justice in India are almost never reported in the British press. The only cause for this is not that these stories may discredit England in Europe and in America. To tell you the truth, the real English ruler is afraid of his higher self. The English possess a great mind. So it is not easy for them to proudly claim: "It was necessary for us to be tyrannical; so we have done right and done it well."

The British people at large know very little of

the real truth about India. The causes for self-reproach are constantly kept away from their attention. And it is equally true, and is indeed a strange irony of fate, that the Britons who have long been reared on incomes from India, and have had their hearts and minds contaminated, wield the real power of the British government that rules over India.

The British government claims that it has exercised the minimum of repressive punishment in connection with the present upheaval in India. We are unwilling to admit this. And yet this claim is not an exaggeration either when compared with the past and the present systems of the governmental repression. We have been beaten up; we have been beaten up by the British plentifully and most foully; and the most disgraceful thing of all is the secret beating; and there was no dearth of that either. And I must also add here that in most cases the glory rests on the head of those who were beaten up. Those who did the beating, today stand deprived of their own honor.

But judged from the point of view of the ordinary way of governments of the world today, our punishment was indeed moderate; especially as the Briton has no race affinity with us—and, speaking militaristically, it was not impossible for them to turn the whole of India into a scene of another Massacre of Amritsar. Suppose the Negroes of America, with pride and with perseverance, became engaged in the task of their separation from the United States of America; then certainly, judging from what happens to the American Negroes in peace time, you would not need an extraordinary power of imagination to guess at the revolting scenes of torrential bloodshed. Besides, it is superfluous to discuss what has happened to Italy and other countries like that.

I am, however, far from consoled by these considerations. The man who constantly beats me with a stick is sure to get tired before long. He may even grow to feel ashamed of himself. But the beating that bleeds the inner man is not satisfied with breaking a few human heads, and then hiding its hideousness behind a bridge party in a club. Here in India, incessantly, and century after century, the entire population is being gangrened into utter ruination by our alien rulers from beyond the seas. Beatings from anger do end; but beatings from greed are both fathomless and limitless.

I see in the literary supplement of the *London Times* that a writer by the name of Mackee claims that the root cause of the poverty of India is overpopulation due to unrestricted marriages. The inner implication of this British claim is that the outside draining of India's wealth would not have been so unbearable if the population of India were much smaller, and they were contented to eke out just a bare existence with the minimum of food. I learn that from 1871 to 1921 the population of England has increased 66 per cent. In fifty years the population of India has increased 33 per cent. Then why this difference? The root cause is not increase in population, but lack of availability of food. And where are we to seek the cause for that?

If both the ruler and the ruled lived in India, there the problem of food would have been solved. In other words, in famine or in plenty, both would share the same fate. But great greed and great oceans separate India from England. So education and health, honor and wealth pine in India most miserably. Only the police increase in number and in power. It needs no expert statisticians to figure out that for the last hundred and sixty years, the current of India's poverty in everything and the current of England's prosperity in everything have run side by side. If I want to paint a perfect picture of this situation I cannot do better than to depict on the same canvas the parallel pictures of the ways of life and livelihood of both the farmers of Bengal that grow jute and the burlap manufacturers in Dundee, Scotland, who reap the harvests of profit from jute. The tie that binds the two is the bond of greed; but the gulf that separates them is the disparity of the enjoyment of life. And this disparity, instead of decreasing during the last century and a half, has rather increased.

When it became possible to multiply a given wealth a thousand-fold by means of machinery, that very moment the age of medieval chivalry became initiated into the age of commerce. The beginning of this age of commerce was ushered in by the discovery of the distant continents and countries of the world by navigators using sea-going vessels. The introduction to this age of commerce was written with highway robberies. In the ghastly agony of the capture of slaves and the plunder of wealth in those days, Mother Earth did indeed cry out most bitterly. This cruel profession was especially carried on in foreign countries. Spain not only gathered gold in Mexico; but also wiped away its entire civilization with human blood. One after another the storms of that western cloud of blood reached the shores of India. It is not necessary here to narrate the history of that episode. The current in the river of wealth and prosperity changed its course, this time from the East to the West.

From then on the throne of monstrous Plutus became firmly established on earth. Science proclaimed that the law of machinery was the law of the universe; and that there is no real and permanent success other than the material success of life. The rigor of competition became all-pervading. Highway robbery became respectable in a new garb. In the pages of European literature we find ample hair-raising descriptions of how ferocious became the disguised slavery, the untruth, and the cruelty of man after openly or stealthily reaching the factories, the mines, and the plantations through avenues of insatiable greed.

In the West, a stupendous conflict between capital and labor has been going on for some time. The highest religion of man is his duty to human society. And greed is the greatest enemy of this religion. In this age of commerce that enemy—greed—is shaking human society to its very foundation, and is loosening and shattering to pieces all the ties of human relationship.

It is certainly painful that the cruel process of acquisition of wealth should create chasms even amongst the peoples of the same race in the same country. And still, in spite of all the sorrows of such a situation it must be admitted that in those countries the avenues of opportunities are equally open to all. There may be differences in the possession of power; but there is no opposition to the possession of property. In the whirl of the grind-

stones of wealth in those lands the employe of today becomes the employer of tomorrow. Furthermore, at least a part of the wealth that is accumulated by the rich is automatically distributed in various forms amongst the people scattered all over the country. Individual prosperity cannot help assuming a great part of the responsibility for national prosperity. Public education, public health, public amusements, public welfare work—all these cost tremendous amounts of money. Willingly or unwillingly, directly or indirectly, the nation's various claims like these are generally met by the rich.

But in India only the least of the leavings of the wealth that enriches the British merchants and the rulers fall to the lot of the people. The jute farmers of Bengal are in the direst need of education and sanitation. They appeal for relief even as parched pools and canals in the summer appeal for rain. But they receive absolutely nothing from the outgoing profits of the British jute merchants in India. These profits go out of India very quickly. The sources of water supply in the villages have been contaminated to make these profits possible; and yet these alien jute merchants do not spend even a penny from their bloated purses to relieve famines of water. And if provision for water is to be made, then the entire taxes have to be paid by these poor, helpless and foodless farmers of India.

The British treasury has no funds for the education of the public. Why? The main cause for this is that vast amounts of India's wealth are most thoroughly drained out of India. This is England's greed-money. Thus our own money completely becomes English money. In other words, clouds are formed from the waters of these shores; but they pour their life-giving showers on the lands of English shores. In fact the unfortunate, the illiterate, the unhealthy and the dying India has for long silently supplied the means for the support of the schools and the hospitals of England.

For a long time I have been observing with my own eyes the extremely sorrowful picture of the physical and mental condition of my compatriots. Man is not only killed by poverty; he also becomes an object of disdain. Sir John Simon says: "In our view the most formidable of the evils from which India is suffering have their roots in social and economic customs of long standing which can only be remedied by the action of the Indian people themselves." These are words of contempt. Here he is not judging the needs of India by his own British standard of life. They themselves enjoy unbounded education, liberty, and opportunity for earning money abundantly. Thus their ideal of earning their livelihood has been immeasurably enriched in wisdom, in action, and in enjoyment. The British statesmen can never think of these things when they talk of ill-clothed, emaciated, sick, and uneducated India. They are anxious to have us stop the growth of population in India; to have us curtail the budget of our expenses so that they may ever maintain their high standard of life and living at the expense of that of our own. Thus ends their process of thinking. Hence, the responsibility for a remedy falls fully on our shoulders. Thus those that have made all remedies impossible are absolved of all of their responsibilities.

After giving up all complaints against God and man, I have been for a while using my humble ability to revive the vitality of the very life of our villages. In this enterprise of mine I have not neglected any government aid. I even hoped for help. But I hoped in vain. Heartlessness is the chief cause for my disappointment. It is not possible to awaken sympathy in the British heart. Our powerlessness and our misery of all sorts have rendered all our claims futile. I have at last come to the conclusion that in any really worthy enterprise for the welfare of the nation, proper coöperation between our workers and the government is not at all possible. So I have decided to do all I can by myself, and with whatever little money I may have left after paying the taxes for the British police.

I went to Russia at a time when British greed and its concomitant intolerable indifference thickened the darkness of the despair most in my mind. In other countries of Europe I have seen enough of pomp of wealth. And the pyramid of that pomp is so high that even the envy of a poverty-stricken country like India cannot reach its summit. That splendor of luxury is absolutely absent in Russia. Perhaps that is the reason why it was easy for me to observe her new inner splendor.

I found Russia making titanic endeavors to make the blessing of education universal, a blessing from which India is completely deprived. It is true that I have seen it all through my eyes that have been hungry and thirsty for so long. It is not possible for me to properly judge as to how these things will strike a fortunate free man of a free country of Europe. I do not want to argue here about the figures regarding the amount of wealth that was transferred from India to the British Isles in the past; and what amount is being transferred every year now through different channels. But I now see very clearly, and many English writers admit it, that the human mind is being crippled and crushed in the bloodless body of our country. There is no happiness in life. We are dying out both physically and mentally. And then to claim that the root cause of this lies in the inherent shortcomings of the people of India, and that the government is fully unable to remedy the evils is certainly a calumny which we defiantly refuse to accept as true.

But I always knew that the conflict of interests between India and her alien rulers was intensely bitter; and that there was no love lost between the two. So the government seeking its own welfare was ever anxious to forcibly uphold its own laws and its own ordinances. But the government is most indifferent in exerting the least effort in things in which the people are most vitally interested—the things that will revitalize the nation in health, wealth, and mind. In other words, the British rulers are loathe to show even a fraction of the attention and sympathy they show for their own country. And yet, our wealth and our life happen to be in their keeping. The ways and the means by which we can save ourselves from utter ruination are not in our hands, but in theirs.

Even if it is true that we are at the very point of death as a nation on account of the sins of our society, then it is also equally true that the education and the training that can cure the evils are also dependent on our alien rulers' will, and our treasury which they control.

The dangers of a nation-wide illiteracy cannot be removed from a country by the mere advisory report of a Royal commission. The British government would have been inordinately active if the same problem of illiteracy faced the British Isles. The British Raj should do exactly the same in India. We ask the following questions of the Simon Commission: If it is true that the vampire has so long been able to suck the very life-blood of India on account of her ignorance and illiteracy, then why has not the British rule of one hundred and sixty years relieved the situation? Has the Simon Commission shown by means of statistics how much money is spent in India to buy batons for the police; and how much for the education of her children? The batons of the police are quite indispensable to a rich ruler from a far-off land; and their rule can go smoothly on even if the expenditure for the education of India's thick-heads is postponed for a few centuries!

When I stepped into Russia the first thing I noticed was the diffusion of education amongst the farmers and the workers of the land. About eight years ago these farmers and the workers of Russia were as helpless, as famine-stricken, as oppressed, and as illiterate as the general public of India. In many ways they were more heavily burdened with sorrow than our people at home. And yet, the Russian government, during the last few years, is most studiously spreading more education amongst these classes than the British government has been doing amongst the higher classes of India for the last century and a half. In my dreams for our national education, the picture I am afraid to paint on even the canvas of fancy, I find here spread all over, from one end of Soviet Russia to the other.

I have repeatedly asked myself how such a stupendously wonderful thing could be made possible in Russia. The answer I have discovered within myself is that Russia is practically free from the least trace of opposition that emanates from greed. They never hesitate for a moment to accept the problem of the universality of utmost equality of power through education. They are not afraid in the least to grant full education to the citizens of far-off Asian Turkomanistan. Instead, they are aggressively anxious to spread education there. It is alien to their psychology to report that the root cause of the sorrows of the people of Turkomanistan is their traditional ignorance, and then sit quite indifferent to their fate.

In connection with the spread of education in Cochin-China I learn that a French quack of learning has said that France should not repeat there the mistakes England has committed in educating the people of India. It must be admitted that there is such a magnanimity in English character which causes the British occasionally to commit such mistakes in their rule. In the dense weaving of their pattern of government, here and there, now and then they skip a thread or two. Otherwise it would have taken us another fifty years to become so articulate as we are today.

It is not possible to deny that human energy becomes impotent through lack of education. Hence illiteracy is not less powerful than the baton of the police. It seems that Lord Curzon somewhat realized the truth of this statement. In matters of education, the French scholar judges the needs of his own country from one standard; and those of the French colonies from quite a different one. Greed is the only cause for this. The reality of the manhood of the powerfully greedy is rather indifferently vague to the victims of greed. And the claims of these victims are naturally ignored and crushed. That is why the upper dog is permanently indifferent to even the vital needs of the underdog. Our British rulers scarcely deign to notice what kind of food we are forced to live on, what kind of water we have to drink, and with what dense darkness of deep non-education our minds are surrounded. Because it is of major importance that they need us, it is not so important for them to think that we too have our vital needs. Besides, we have been reduced to such a state of insignificance that it becomes impossible for them to honor our needs at all. The problem of India—the problem that has for so long ruined us financially, physically, and mentally—yes, that problem is altogether absent in western lands. The problem is that all the proprietary rights of India are divided in two. And at the root of that murderous partition lies greed. So when I came to Russia and found this greed banished, I was naturally beside myself with joy. A man from another country may not feel so happy over the plane of existence in Russia. But I cannot help thinking that the root cause of the net of grave danger that surrounds the whole world is greed. This greed is the cause of all fear, all doubt, all armaments, and all deceptive and cruel diplomacy.

[To Be Concluded in the Next Issue]

The Study Table

A Program for Peace Workers

TRAINING FOR PEACE. *By Richard Gregg. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. Paper edition. 50 cents.*

When Richard Gregg wrote and published *The Power of Non-Violence,* he contributed to peace literature the most important volume of our time. Its recognition and acclaim have made it a classic, and its use a bible of the cause. Now Mr. Gregg offers this pamphlet of forty pages as a supplement to his larger work, in the sense that a prayer-book or manual of spiritual exercises may be regarded as a supplement to the scriptures.

What the author has prepared is a program for pacifists which may help to make their work for the cause of peace along non-violent lines effective. The essence of the book is discipline. Mere refusal to take part in war, he says, is not enough. This is a purely negative policy, and what is needed is something grandly positive. Such positive action must begin with training, as the soldier's service in the front line trenches begins with long months of drilling in camp. "Take a leaf out of the soldier's book," says Mr. Gregg, and learn what training means in terms of efficiency and morale.

First in Mr. Gregg's program is a course of reading. He gives a long list of books and pamphlets comprising the best literature of pacificism. These are not only to be read and studied, but also discussed in the team or group meetings in which, by the way, the paci-

fist's training is to be done. For the pacifist, no more than the soldier, can drill alone!

Then comes "the cultivation of the qualities and sentiments which will lead them [pacifists] to take non-violent action." Most elemental and fundamental of all these "inner attitudes" is self-respect, which is "the foundation of all moral progress." This begins in such outward aspects of personality as bodily cleanliness, and climbs to such inner realities as "the conviction of the worthiness of our aims and methods." Next in importance to self-respect is the sentiment of "unity with all mankind," which includes opponents, even enemies. This may be developed by such simple devices as group singing, folk dancing and rhythmic exercises, hiking and games, group discussion, meditation, and prayer. Then come the cultivation of morale and the development of courage. Action, of course, is always more important than study or arbitrary exercises, and thus Mr. Gregg lays great stress on a "program of deeds." This may be as simple and unpretentious a thing as manual work, such as housekeeping, gardening, or arts and crafts, and as heroic and sublime a thing as Quaker relief and reconstruction work in war areas. Service for prisoners, the unemployed, the underprivileged and dispossessed classes is indispensable as a mode of action. Pacifism must be well-founded in peace if it is to meet triumphantly the challenge of war.

Mr. Gregg enriches his discussion with abundant practical advice. He describes in great detail the things that we must do. And interfusing all his description of these things is the glow of his unquenchable idealism. This handbook should be on the table and in the heart of every pacifist. It is a guide to conduct which may help us all.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Overcome Evil with Good

KILL OR CURE? *By Muriel Lester. Nashville, Tenn.: Cokesbury Press. 136 pp. $1.00.*

Here is a grand and glorious tract to put into the hands of those who may be wavering in their allegiance to the principles of the Prince of Peace. Miss Lester with dramatic effect, due largely to the simplicity of her narrative, not only makes one know the anti-Christ that the war system is, but shows from her experiences—especially at Kingsley Hall in the East End of London—just how a pacifist actually triumphs over those who rely upon violence to achieve their ends. Will one ever forget the day Miss Lester and her "little group of pacifists" won the day through love over the mob, headed by the drunken woman who had threatened to throw vitriol in Miss Lester's eyes?

Another quiver of very sharp arrows for the pacifist in his task of convincing others of the effectiveness of overcoming evil with good.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE

Correspondence

Minorities and the Court

Editor of UNITY:

I see that UNITY welcomes free discussion of the supreme court policy of President Roosevelt. While I am unable to make up my mind as to whether I favor a court reduced to one member—Judge Roberts of course—in the interest of economy and less discussion; or whether I favor a court even much larger than the President asks for, on the theory of the more the merrier, I do wish to call attention to what seems to me a contradiction in editorials of May 3.

In "The Menace of Disappearing Minorities" we read, "The essence and glory of democracy are found in the presence of militant minorities," and the writer views with evident alarm the fact that "we are so far advanced toward one-man rule."

In the following editorial, "Division Every Which-Way," it is stated that the differences of opinion on the President's supreme court policy is splitting us in every direction, and the writer is "impressed by the madness of the President in spreading this wild confusion at the very moment when he had in his hands such united and enthusiastic support as no other chief executive in our history has ever won," and exclaims, "What an opening for his second administration—a great leader with an army at his back to march to triumph!". The editorial closes with the woeful statement that "No matter how the fight ends the damage is irreparable."

Is it not just possible that the President's court policy has provided the opposition, the absence of which is deplored in the first editorial, and that just because it has brought about new alignments, making liberals and reactionaries to lie down together, we may see such a rattling of dry bones as to bring to the old and spineless parties the health and vigor they are, in the first editorial, said to need? In union there may be strength, but out of our differences may come better understanding.

MAY STRANATHAN.

Cumberland, Ohio.

Proportional Representation

Editor of UNITY:

May I be permitted to comment on an editorial in UNITY for May 3, "The Menace of Disappearing Minorities."

In this editorial it is suggested that "We shall know that England is the greatest democracy in the world just so long as 'His Majesty's Opposition' is not only tolerated but actually fostered and encouraged." I submit that the British election system by the single-member-district tends to give representation, on the whole, only to the largest opposition political party and that only in the most haphazard way. Smaller opposition groups than that tend to receive not even such blundering toleration, let alone fostering and encouragement. Hence the virtual disappearance from the House of Commons of the representatives of a party which examination of British life shows to be far larger than is revealed either by the number of candidates it presents, the votes cast for them, or the number elected; this is, of course, the Liberals. The British system is better described as a gamble in which the largest party runs a good chance of electing a minority of the members, the next largest party may elect only its poorest spokesmen, and all other parties will be under-represented or not at all. That is a long way from tolerating, fostering, and encouraging opposition.

And I am convinced that it is our use of the same system which is responsible for the political behavior on the part of our minorities against which the editorial

inveighs. The minorities mentioned, the American Labor Party, the Farmer-Labor Party, the Socialist Party, and the Communist Party, by running candidates for President, and, in most cases, for United States Senator and Congressmen, achieve only the ironic effect of making more certain the election of the most conservative candidate running, candidates who may well be suspected of fascist inclinations. When we grasp the point that the method of nomination, of voting, and of counting votes is by far the most important environmental factor that determines the political behavior of groups, we will no longer denounce such behavior as immoral if it does not suit us. Rather we will seek to spread that change in election procedure which New York City has accepted for the election of its governing body. This method is so fair that it is a foregone conclusion that if such minority leaders as Norman Thomas and John Haynes Holmes consent to be candidates, they can both be elected to that body. That method is the Hare system of Proportional Representation. WALTER J. MILLARD.

A Grand Tribute from a Grand Friend

Editor of UNITY:

Great is UNITY! How few papers would have brains and courage enough to present Gandhi and Tagore, and to stand for really righteous causes!

Few editors these days ever heard of Theodore Parker, and yet you bring him to life! "The Brother of the Unknown Soldier" might well go out as a pamphlet. SYDNEY STRONG.

Seattle, Washington.

Abraham Lincoln Centre Camp

NEAR MILTON JUNCTION, WIS.

FROM the latter part of June to the early part of September Abraham Lincoln Centre Camp provides five camp periods of 40 campers each. The cost per camper is about $1 a day. During the 1936 season, of a total of 193 campers, 120 were taken free; 30 were paid for by other agencies; 36 were paid for in part by parents, friends, or agencies; and only 7 paid in full. This was made possible by special gifts.

We earnestly solicit your contribution.

$1 pays for 1 child for 1 day.
$7 pays for 1 child for 1 week.
$14 pays for 1 child for a full camp period.

Make checks payable to Abraham Lincoln Centre and mail to

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE
700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago

The Field

(*Continued from page* 126)

for the Filipinos is economic health; and no economic security can be achieved when so heavy a proportion of the Philippine budget must go for military expenditures.

—*Nofrontier News Service.*

Obey Blindly!

Austria has just had an enlightening experience with its militarists, according to a story in *Peace News*. A young infantryman, 22-year-old Leopold Sauner, was placed on trial for "military insubordination," because he had refused to obey an order of his superior officer. The order must have been pretty obnoxious, because the judge sentenced the accused to only one week's imprisonment "with reprieve." At the same time he lectured the soldier as follows:

I can only give you this advice. When you get any order—never think about it. Whether it is right or wrong, you have to obey blindly.

A soldier must not think, but has to obey blindly. Whether the order is logical or not does not concern him.

—*Nofrontier News Service.*

An Appeal

Partisan organizations to help Spain are multiplying. Appeals for money to send food and medical supplies to the Loyalists, or to the Rebels, are constantly appearing. But why should help of this kind be limited to one side of this hideous conflict? If our sympathies and impulses to help are truly humanitarian, why should we not bring succor to *all* who suffer in Spain?

One relief agency is in the field to help victims of the war on *both* sides of the battle-front in stricken Spain—characteristically organized by the Quakers. This is the American Friends Service Committee, which has already sent two workers across the seas "with relief supplies for suffering mothers and children of both sides." The Committee is appealing for $100,000 in 1937. Send gifts of money, or clean, warm clothing to John F. Reich, Secretary, Committee on Spain, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia. J. H. H.

John Haynes Holmes, Editor — Curtis W. Reese, Managing Editor

UNITY

Introducing UNITY to new readers, we offer a trial subscription of . . .

6 Months for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

Please enter my subscription for a trial period of six months, for which I enclose $1.00.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....

Published semi-monthly.
Regular subscription $3.00.